	Case 3:05-cv-05639-FDB Document 47	Filed 12/20/06 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON	
9	AT TACOMA	
10	DR. MAX ARNETT,	
11	Plaintiff,	G N G05 5620 FDD
12	v.	Case No. C05-5639 FDB
13 14	OHIO NATIONAL LIFE ASSURANCE CORPORATION,	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION
15	Defendant.	
16		
17	Disinstiff has account from a consideration of this County, Natural and 20, 2006 Contag Dismission	
18	Action for Failure to Comply with Discovery Orders. The Plaintiff asserts his belief that he has "fully	
19	cooperated with all his obligations under the court rules and is not in default of any of them." The	
20	Court requested Defendant file a response to the motion. Defendant points out that despite	
21	Plaintiff's request for relief, Plaintiff has never responded to this Court's previously orders	
22	compelling discovery, nor has Plaintiff paid the Court-ordered sanctions.	
23	MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION	
24	Pursuant to Local Rules W.D. Wash. CR 7(h)(1), motions for reconsideration are disfavored,	
25	and will ordinarily be denied unless there is a showing of (a) manifest error in the prior ruling, or (b)	
26	ORDER - 1	

1	facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to the attention of the court earlier,	
2	through reasonable diligence. Plaintiff's has not made the requisite showing as to either of the	
3	grounds for reconsideration under CR 7(h)(1). Plaintiff rather, attempts to use this motion to raise	
4	factual arguments that should or could have been brought to the Court's attention in a timely fashion	
5	The Court is not persuaded by this argument. Plaintiff's motion does not demonstrate a manifest	
6	error in the Court's prior ruling dismissing the action nor does it provide the Court with any new	
7	information that could not have been brought to the Court through the exercise of reasonable	
8	diligence.	
9	CONCLUSION	
10	For the reasons set forth above, Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration will be denied. DENIED .	
11	ACCORDINGLY,	
12	IT IS ORDERED:	
13	Defendant's Motion for Reconsideration of Ruling on Dismissal [Dkt. # 43] is DENIED .	
14		
15	DATED this 19 th day of December, 2006.	
16		
17	Jul Marie Contraction of the Con	
18	FRANKLIN D. BURGESS	
19	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26	ORDER - 2	